

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Everett McKinley Dirksen  
United States Courthouse  
Room 2722 - 219 S. Dearborn Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60604



Office of the Clerk  
Phone: (312) 435-5850  
www.ca7.uscourts.gov

ORDER

February 20, 2024

Before  
DIANE S. SYKES, *Chief Judge*  
ILANA DIAMOND ROVNER, *Circuit Judge*  
MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Circuit Judge*

CERTIFIED COPY

A True Copy

Teste:

  
Deputy Clerk  
of the United States  
Court of Appeals for the  
Seventh Circuit

No. 23-2361	MATTIE YOAKUM, Plaintiff - Appellant  v.  MADISON UNITED HEALTHCARE LINEN, Defendant - Appellee
<b>Originating Case Information:</b> District Court No: 3:22-cv-00053-wmc Western District of Wisconsin District Judge William M. Conley	

The following are before the court:

1. **MOTION TO DISMISS**, filed on January 23, 2024, by counsel for the appellee.
2. **RESPONSE TO MOTION TO DISMISS**, filed on February 12, 2024, by the pro se appellant.

We have carefully reviewed appellant Mattie Yoakum's opening brief, filed on January 3, 2024, her response to appellee's motion, and the record on appeal. Based on this review, we conclude that further briefing would not be useful to the court. *See Taylor v. City of New Albany*, 979 F.2d 87 (7th Cir. 1992). The district court granted Madison United Healthcare Linen's motion for summary judgment because Yoakum failed to show that the conditions of her employment constituted a hostile work environment and Madison took remedial action, and because Yoakum did not present evidence from which a jury could reasonably infer that she would not

No. 23-2361

Page 2

have been fired absent her complaint to human resources. In her brief, Yoakum generally challenges this ruling but does not provide any meaningful basis for disturbing the judgment. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8) (brief must contain the appellant’s “contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies”); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001). We recognize that Yoakum is representing herself on appeal, but even self-represented parties must comply with Rule 28(a). *See Atkins v. Gilbert*, 52 F.4th 359, 361 (7th Cir. 2022). Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the appellee’s motion is **GRANTED** and this appeal is **DISMISSED**.

form name: c7\_Order\_3J (form ID: 177)